



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/747,720

12/29/2003

Ramon M. Velez JR.

1235_001

5879

20874

7590

09/07/2006

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI
101 SOUTH SALINA STREET
SUITE 400
SYRACUSE, NY 13202

EXAMINER

EL ARINI, ZEINAB

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/747,720
Filing Date: December 29, 2003
Appellant(s): VELEZ, RAMON M.

MAILED

SEP 07 2006

GROUP 1700

Dana F. Bigelow
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Art Unit: 1746

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/11/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/11/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,679,174	Buongiorno	10-1997
1,492,905	Swanick	5-1924

5,464,479

Kenton et al.

11-1995

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buongiorno (5,679,174) in combination with Swanick (1,492,905) or Kenton et al. (5,464,479).

Buongiorno discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning internal passageways of an airfoil (turbine blade) by inserting a tube into the internal passageway. See col. 1, lines 64-67, col. 2, lines 1-10, and 25-61, col. 3, line 1- col. 4, line 5, and the claims. The reference discloses all limitations with the exception of installing a plurality of parts into a holder, providing a guide member, and providing a manifold as claimed.

Swanick discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning internal surface of a component by inserting a tube inside the component and dispensing a cleaning fluid into the internal surfaces. The apparatus has a plurality of nozzles, which are connected to common manifold 3. See Figs. 1-2, page 1, line 69- page 2, line 10, and the claims.

The reference discloses the installing step, the manifold, and the guide member as claimed.

Kenton et al. disclose a method for removing undesired material from internal spaces of parts (blades). The reference discloses installing a plurality of parts into a fixture, which is mounted in the flushing cabinet. The high-pressure flush system comprises a cabinet, a central pump, a water source, and plurality of hoses. The attachment hoses extend from the shuttle valve through cabinet wall fittings and connect to disconnect provided on the part holding fixture. The fixture, in turn, is designated to direct water from the hoses into the internal spaces of the blade. See col. 8, line 50- col. 9, line 30, and Fig. 3.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the multiple dispensing means taught by Swanick or Kenton et al. in the Buongiorno process for the purpose of treating multiple components simultaneously to reduce the treatment time and to increase the process efficiency. The references fail to disclose probes are of different length. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time applicant invented the claimed process to utilize different lengths of dispensing means for the purpose of using the process for different lengths of components. One would have been motivated to change the length of the tubes so that can fit different lengths of components or tubes and clean the internal surface.

(10) Response to Argument

1. Appellant's argument with respect to Swanick is unpersuasive, because wash out the contents, flushing the internal surface and emptying the contents from the surface are all equivalent.

2. In response to appellant's argument that Swanick does not provide a guide member, appellant argues is unpersuasive. See the guide member 2 in Fig. 1.

3. Appellant's argument with respect to Buongiorno in combination with Swanick and Kenton et al. is unpersuasive. This is because it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the multiple dispensing means taught by Swanick or Kenton et al. in the Buongiorno process for the purpose of treating multiple components simultaneously to reduce the treatment time and to increase the process efficiency. The references fail to disclose probes are of different length. One skilled in the art would choose the length of the probes depend on the depth of the cavities. See Buongiorno, Figs. 3 and 4. Using hoses in Kenton et al. will be able to perform the same function of using the probes as claimed.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 1746

Respectfully submitted,

Zeinab EL-Arini *Zeinab Elarini*

Conferees:

Michael Barr

Jennifer Kolb-Michener

J. K. Michener

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Michael Barr', written over a horizontal line.

MICHAEL BARR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER